<center>**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**</center>

In the Office Action mailed October 26, 2007, claims 1-6, 10, 12-15, 17, 19-21, 23-26, 28, 30, 31, 34, and 35 were rejected. Additionally, claims 7, 9, 18, 23, 32, 33, and 36 were objected to, and claims 7, 9, 18, 32, 33, and 36 would be allowable if rewritten and independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. In response, Applicant hereby requests reconsideration of the application in view of the amended claims and the below-provided remarks. No claims are added or canceled.

For reference, claims 1, 10, 12, 13, 15, 19, 23, and 24 are amended. In particular, claims 1, 10, 12, 15, 19, and 24 are each amended to recite new data transaction commands of a specified data transaction command type. Applicant submits that these amendments clarify the previous references to a specified data transaction command type. These amendments are supported, for example, by the subject matter described in the specification at page 5, lines 18-22. Claim 13 is amended to correct a typographical error. Claim 23 is amended to change the dependency of the claim, so that it does not depend from canceled claim 22.

<u>Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103</u>

Claims 1, 4-6, 10, 12-15, 19, 23-24, 28, and 30-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carlson et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,544,304, hereinafter Carlson) in view of Meyer et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. US 2002/0188711, hereinafter Meyer). Additionally, claims 2 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carlson in view of Meyer and further in view of Carlson (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. US 2003/0217078, hereinafter Carlson PGPUB). Additionally, claims 17, 20, 21, 25, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carlson and Meyer in view of Matsunami et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,006,308, hereinafter Matsunami). However, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are patentable over Carlson, Meyer, Carlson PGPUB, and Matsunami for the reasons provided below.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Carlson and Meyer because the combination of cited references does not teach all of the limitations of the claim. Claim 1 recites a limitation related to rejecting data transaction commands, except for a new data transaction command of a specified data transaction command type, during a transition of library management functions from a first library manager to a second library manager.

In contrast to the language of claim 1, the cited references do not teach all of the limitations of the claim. In particular, the cited references do not teach rejecting data transaction commands, except for a new data transaction command of a specified data transaction command type. The Office Action acknowledges that Carlson does not teach directing the first library manager to reject data transaction commands, except for a specified data transaction command, as recited in claim. Hence, the Office Action relies on Meyer as purportedly teaching rejecting data transaction commands, except for a specified data transaction command type. In particular, the Office Action attempts to distinguish between "current requests" and "previously accepted requests," apparently as two different data transaction command types.

While this distinction between current and previously accepted requests is not clear from the cited portion of Meyer, which appears to merely refer to current requests, the present language of claim 1 clarifies that the exception to rejecting new data transaction commands applies to new data transaction commands in a specified data transaction command type. In other words, new data transaction commands are not rejected, if the new data transaction commands are of a specified data transaction command type. In contrast, Meyer merely teaches, according to the Office Action, current and previously accepted requests. Thus, Meyer does not teach excepting new data transaction commands based on a specified data transaction command type.

Therefore, the combination of cited references does not teach all of the limitations of the claim because Meyer does not teach rejecting data transaction commands, except for new data transaction commands of a specified data transaction command type. Accordingly, Applicant submits claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Carlson

and Meyer and respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Independent Claims 10, 12, 15, 19, and 24

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 10, 12, 15, 19, and 24 are also patentable over the combination of cited references at least for the reasons stated above in regard to the rejection of independent claim 1. Each of claims 10, 12, 15, 19, and 24 recites at least one limitation related to rejecting data transaction commands, except for new data transaction commands of a specified data transaction command type. Thus, although the language of these claims differs from the language of claim 1, and the scope of these claims should be interpreted independently of claim 1, Applicant respectfully asserts that the remarks provided above in regard to the rejection of claim 1 also apply to the rejections of claims 10, 12, 15, 19, and 24. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits claims 10, 12, 15, 19, and 24 are patentable over the combination of cited references and requests that the rejections of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims

Given that claims 2-7, 9, 13, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 25, 26, 28, and 30-36 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of the corresponding independent claims 1, 10, 12, 15, 19, and 24, which are patentable over the cited references, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 2-7, 9, 13, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 25, 26, 28, and 30-36 are also patentable over the cited references based on allowable base claims. Additionally, each of claims 2-7, 9, 13, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 25, 26, 28, and 30-36 may be allowable for further reasons, as described in Applicant's previous response. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejections of claims 2-7, 9, 13, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 25, 26, 28, and 30-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendments and remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the attorney listed below

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 28, 2008   /Brian C. Kunzler/

Brian C. Kunzler
Reg. No. 38,527

Kunzler & McKenzie
8 East Broadway, Suite 600
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
(801) 994-4646 voice
(801) 531-1929 fax